



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/820,695

04/09/2004

Kaoru Masuda

KOBE.0061

8731

7590 08/22/2007
REED SMITH HAZEL & THOMAS
Suite 1400
3110 Fairview Park Drive
Falls Church, VA 22042

EXAMINER

DELCOTTO, GREGORY R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1751

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/22/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/820,695	Applicant(s) MASUDA ET AL.	
	Examiner Gregory R. Del Cotto	Art Unit 1751	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on RCE filed 5/29/07.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5,7-10,13,14,16 and 18-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5,7-10,13,14,16 and 18-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 5, 7-10, 13, 14, 16, and 18-26 are pending. Claims 2-4, 6, 11, 12, 15, and 17 have been canceled. Note that, Applicant's amendments and arguments filed 5/29/07 have been entered.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/29/07 has been entered.

Priority

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 10/240,848 filed on 10/4/02.

Objections/Rejections Withdrawn

The following objections/rejections as set forth in the Office action mailed 5/3/06 have been withdrawn:

The rejection of claims 1, 5, 7-10, 13, 14, 16, and 18-23 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Art Unit: 1751

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 5, 7-10, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

With respect to instant claims 1, 5, 19, and 23, the specification, as originally filed, provides no basis for "...penetrates the microstructure" as recited by the instant claims. Note that, while the specification provides basis for "penetrates residue which is present on the microstructure", the specification does not provide basis for penetration of the actual microstructure itself. Thus, this is deemed new matter.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 5, 7-10, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to instant claims 1, 5, 19, and 23, these claims are vague and indefinite in that it is unclear what is meant by "...penetrates the microstructure" as recited by the instant claims. Cleaning compositions generally do not penetrate the microstructure itself and it is unclear as to how this would occur. For purposes of

Art Unit: 1751

examination and consistent with the instant specification, the Examiner has interpreted "...penetrates the microstructure" to mean "penetrates residue which is present on the microstructure" and believes that Applicant inadvertently left the word residue out of this phrase. Clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 13, 14, 16, 18-20, and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullee (US 6,306,564) in view of Vaartstra (US 6,242,165) and Skee et al (US 5,989,353).

Mullee teaches a commercially available solvent, such as a stripping chemical and/or an organic solvent, is supported by supercritical CO₂ to remove a resist, its residue, and/or an organic contaminant off the surface of a semiconductor wafer. See Abstract. Preferred types of chemicals include N-methyl pyrrolidone, diglycol amine, hydroxyl amine, catechol, tertiary amines, ammonium fluoride, ammonium bifluoride, etc. Other chemicals such as an organic solvent may be used independently or added to one or more of the chemicals to remove organic contaminants from the wafer surface. These solvents include an alcohol, dimethyl sulfoxide, methanol, ethanol, etc. See column 4, lines 10-30. Although conventionally large amounts of chemicals can be used, it is preferred to introduce each of these chemicals or mixtures of chemicals in an amount that is less than about 15% by volume. See column 4, lines 30-38.

Mullee does not teach an alkyl ammonium fluoride, a quaternary ammonium hydroxide, or a cleaning composition containing carbon dioxide, a alkyl ammonium fluoride compound, a quaternary ammonium hydroxide, a cosolvent, and the other requisite components in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Vaartstra teaches a method for removing organic material in the fabrication of structures including providing a substrate assembly having an exposed organic material and removing at least a portion of the exposed organic material using a composition having at least one component in a supercritical state. See Abstract. Additionally, other components may be added to the compositions to enhance the organic material removal process. Buffering agents such as ammonium fluoride, tetramethyl ammonium

Art Unit: 1751

fluoride, surfactants, etc., may be added to the compositions. See column 6, lines 10-25.

Skee et al teach microelectronics substrates which are cleaned to remove metal contamination while maintaining wafer substrate surface smoothness by contacting the wafer substrate surfaces with an aqueous cleaning solution of an alkaline, metal ion-free base and a polyhydroxy compound. See Abstract. Suitable alkaline components include tetramethylalkyl ammonium hydroxide, tetraethyl ammonium hydroxide, 2-methyl-1, 5-pentanediamine, monoethanolamine, etc. See column 5, lines 1-25.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use tetramethyl ammonium fluoride in the cleaning composition taught by Mullee, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Vaartstra teaches the equivalence of tetramethyl ammonium fluoride to ammonium fluoride in a similar cleaning composition and further, Mullee teaches the use of ammonium fluoride.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use tetramethylammonium hydroxide in the composition taught by Mullee, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Skee et al teach the equivalence of quaternary ammonium hydroxide to various amines as an alkaline compound in a similar cleaning composition and further, Mullee teaches the use of alkaline compounds including various amines.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a cleaning composition containing carbon dioxide, a fluoride compound, a quaternary ammonium hydroxide, a cosolvent, and the other

Art Unit: 1751

requisite components in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success and similar results with respect to other disclosed components, because the broad teachings of Mullee in combination with Vaartstra and Skee et al suggest a cleaning composition containing carbon dioxide, a fluoride compound, a quaternary ammonium hydroxide, a cosolvent, and the other requisite components in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Claims 1, 5, 7-10, 16, 18-20, and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 01/33613 in view of Vaartstra (US 6,242,165) and Skee et al (US 5,989,353).

Note that, while a translation of the priority document has been submitted, the Examiner asserts that the document does not provide priority for an ammonium fluoride having the formula as recited by instant claims 1, 5, 20 and 23 wherein the R groups may be any alkyl group or for "a compound having a hydroxyl group" as recited by instant claim 5. The priority document does provide support for specific ammonium fluorides as recited by instant claim 13. Thus, '613 is still applicable over the rejected claims as set forth above.

'613 teaches a method of removing photoresist and residue from a substrate by maintaining supercritical carbon dioxide, an amine, and a solvent in contact with the substrate so that the amine and the solvent at least partially dissolve the photoresist and the residue. See Abstract. Preferable amines include (2-(methylamino)ethanol, PMDETA, triethanolamine, etc. Preferably, the solvent is selected from DMSO, ethylene carbonate, N-methylpyrrolidone, BLO, acetic acid, etc. See page 5, lines 5-30.

Art Unit: 1751

One embodiment of the invention includes a composition containing an aqueous fluoride such as ammonium fluoride, an amine, and solvent for cleaning photoresists. See page 10, lines 25-35. Note that, the Examiner asserts that the broad teachings of '613 would suggest compositions containing the required components in amounts which overlap with the amounts recited by the instant claims.

'613 does not teach an alkyl ammonium fluoride, a quaternary ammonium hydroxide, or a cleaning composition containing carbon dioxide, a alkyl ammonium fluoride compound, a quaternary ammonium hydroxide, a cosolvent, and the other requisite components in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Vaarstra and Skee et al are relied upon as set forth above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use tetramethyl ammonium fluoride in the cleaning composition taught by '613, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Vaartstra teaches the equivalence of tetramethyl ammonium fluoride to ammonium fluoride in a similar cleaning composition and further, '613 teaches the use of ammonium fluoride.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use tetramethylammonium hydroxide in the composition taught by '613, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Skee et al teach the equivalence of quaternary ammonium hydroxide to various amines as an alkaline compound in a similar cleaning composition and further, '613 teaches the use of alkaline compounds including various amines.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a cleaning composition containing carbon dioxide, a fluoride compound, a quaternary ammonium hydroxide, a cosolvent, and the other requisite components in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success and similar results with respect to other disclosed components, because the broad teachings of '613 in combination with Vaartstra and Skee et al suggest a cleaning composition containing carbon dioxide, a fluoride compound, a quaternary ammonium compound, a cosolvent, and the other requisite components in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Claims 1, 5, 7-10, 13, 14, 16, 18-20, and 23-26 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu et al (US 2003/0125225) in view of Skee et al (US 5,989,353).

Note that, while a translation of the priority document has been submitted, the Examiner asserts that the document does not provide priority for an ammonium fluoride having the formula as recited by instant claims 1, 5, 20 and 23 wherein the R groups may be any alkyl group or for "a compound having a hydroxyl group" as recited by instant claim 5. The priority document does provide support for specific ammonium fluorides as recited by instant claim 13. Thus, Xu et al is still applicable over the rejected claims as set forth above.

Xu et al teach chemical formulations and methods for removing unwanted material, such as unexposed photoresist, metal oxides, CMP residue, and the like, from semiconductor wafers or other substrates. The formulations utilize a supercritical fluid-

based cleaning composition, which may further include co-solvent(s), surfactant(s), chelating agent(s), and/or chemical reactant(s). See Abstract. Suitable supercritical fluids include carbon dioxide, oxygen, argon, water, ammonia, etc. Suitable co-solvents include methanol, ethanol, N-methylpyrrolidone, monoethanolamine, alkyl ammonium fluoride, butylene carbonate, etc. See para. 10-12. One preferred embodiment relates to a cleaning composition comprising supercritical carbon dioxide, isopropanol, and ammonium fluoride. See para. 29. Another embodiment includes a composition containing a supercritical fluid, cosolvent, active agent, surfactant, and chelating agent. See para. 38. Suitable active agents include ammonium fluoride, alkyl sulfonic acids, alkyl amines, etc. See para. 43. Surfactants useful may be of any type and include anionic, nonionic, cationic, and zwitterionic types. See para. 46. The components may be present at concentrations of from about 0.1% by weight to about 50% by weight, when present in the formulation, or alternatively in concentration ranges having minima such as 0.2%, 0.5%, 1%, and 5% and maxima such as 25%, 20%, 18%, 15%, 12%, and 10%, in any permutative combinations thereof. See para. 51.

Specifically, Xu et al teach a cleaning composition containing supercritical CO₂, isopropanol, and ammonium fluoride. See paras. 89-91.

Xu et al do not teach the use of a quaternary ammonium hydroxide or a cleaning composition containing carbon dioxide, a alkyl ammonium fluoride compound, a quaternary ammonium hydroxide, a cosolvent, and the other requisite components in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Skee et al are relied upon as set forth above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use tetramethylammonium hydroxide in the composition taught by Xu et al, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Skee et al teach the equivalence of quaternary ammonium hydroxide to various amines as an alkaline compound in a similar cleaning composition and further, Xu et al teach the use of alkaline compounds including various amines.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a cleaning composition containing carbon dioxide, a fluoride compound, a quaternary ammonium hydroxide, a cosolvent, and the other requisite components in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success and similar results with respect to other disclosed components, because the broad teachings of Xu et al in combination with Skee et al suggest a cleaning composition containing carbon dioxide, a fluoride compound, a quaternary ammonium compound, a cosolvent, and the other requisite components in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullee (US 6,306,564) in view of Vaarstra and Skee et al (US 5,989,353), WO 01/33613 in view of Vaarstra and Skee et al (US 5,989,353), or Xu et al (US 2003/0125225) in view of Skee et al (US 5,989,353) as applied to the rejected claims above, and further in view of McCullough et al (US 5,976,264).

Mullee, '613, Vaarstra, Xu et al, and Skee et al are relied upon as set forth above. However, none of the references teach the use of methane or a fluorosurfactant

Art Unit: 1751

in addition to the other requisite components of the composition as recited by instant claims 21 and 22.

McCullough et al teach a method for the removal of fluorine or chlorine residue from an etched precision surface such as a semiconductor sample which comprises exposing said precision surface to liquid CO₂ under appropriate conditions that are sufficient to remove the residue from the precision surface. See Abstract. The preferred supercritical fluid is carbon dioxide which may be used alone or in admixture with another additive such as H₂O, Ar, NH₃, methane, etc. Surfactants which aid in removing the reactive ion etching residue from the semiconductor sample containing at least one CF_x functional group may also be used in conjunction with a supercritical fluid. See column 5, lines 5-30.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use methane in the cleaning composition taught by Mullee, '613, or Xu et al, with a reasonable expectation of success, because McCullough et al teach the equivalence of methane to carbon dioxide as a supercritical fluid in a similar cleaning composition and further, Mullee, '613, and Xu et al teach the use of carbon dioxide as a supercritical fluid.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use a surfactant containing at least one CF_x functional group in the composition taught by Mullee, '613, or Xu et al, with a reasonable expectation of success, because McCullough et al teach the use of a surfactant containing at least one

Art Unit: 1751

CF_x functional group aid in semiconductor residue removal in a similar composition which would be desirable in the compositions taught by Mullee, '613, or Xu et al.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullee (US 6,306,564) in view of Vaarstra as applied to claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 13, 14, 16, 18-20, and 23-26 above, and further in view of McCullough et al (US 5,976,264) or WO01/33613.

Mullee and Vaarstra are relied upon as set forth above. However, Mullee do not teach the use of water in addition to the other requisite components of the composition as recited by the instant claims.

McCullough et al or '613 are relied upon as set forth above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use water in the cleaning composition taught by Mullee, with a reasonable expectation of success, because McCullough et al teach the equivalence of H₂O to carbon dioxide as a supercritical fluid in a similar cleaning composition and, further, Mullee teaches the use of supercritical CO₂.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use water in the cleaning composition taught by Mullee, with a reasonable expectation of success, because '613 teaches the use of aqueous solutions of ammonium fluoride in a similar cleaning composition and, further, Mullee teaches the use of ammonium fluoride in general which usually is formulated as an aqueous solution.

Response to Arguments

With respect to Mullee, '613, or Xu et al, Applicant states that none of these references teach or suggest a composition of elements that are combined together so as to be applied to the microstructure intended to be cleaned as a single composition wherein the amounts of the required components used in the composition are such that the composition effectively penetrates the microstructure as recited by the instant claims.

In response, note that, the Examiner maintains, as stated previously, that each of these references in combination with secondary references teach a single composition containing the requisite components of the composition in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims. Note that, Mullee teaches that the supercritical carbon dioxide may contain a small amount of one or more chemicals which indicates that the supercritical carbon dioxide plus the additional components may be used as a single composition (See column 4, lines 1-40). '613 teaches that the composition used to remove photoresist residues contains supercritical carbon dioxide, an amine, a solvent, and aqueous fluoride which is a single composition and suggests the same amounts of these components as recited by the instant claims (See page 10, lines 25-35). Further, Xu et al teach formulations which utilize a supercritical fluid-based cleaning composition which may further include a co-solvent, surfactant, chelating agent, and chemical reactant. See Abstract. These additional components are used in the same amounts as recited by the instant claims. See para. 51. Suitable supercritical fluids include carbon dioxide. See paras. 32-33. Xu et al teach single compositions which may be used to clean photoresist substrates. Thus, the Examiner maintains that the broad

teachings of Mullee, '613, or Xu et al suggest single compositions containing supercritical carbon dioxide along with other components which may be used to clean substrates which are the same as the single compositions recited by the instant claims. Additionally, the Examiner maintains that each of Mullee, '613, or Xu et al are drawn to compositions for removing residues from microstructure substrates which would clearly indicate penetration of the residue on the microstructure and would suggest compositions having the same ability to penetrate any residue on the microstructure because Mullee, '613, or Xu in combination with select secondary references, as set forth above, suggest compositions containing the same components in the same amounts as recited by the instant claims. Note that, the instant claims simply require that the composition penetrates the residue and require no specific amount or degree of penetration.

With respect to Vaarstra and Skee et al, Applicant once states that neither of these secondary references provide any disclosure, teaching or suggestion that makes up for the deficiencies in Mullee, '613, or Xu et al such that their combination could embody each and every feature of the present invention as claimed. In response, note that, as stated previously, Vaarstra and Skee et al are secondary references relied upon for their teaching of tetramethyl ammonium fluoride and tetramethylammonium hydroxide, respectively. The Examiner maintains that one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly have been motivated to use tetramethyl ammonium fluoride in the composition taught by Mullee or '613, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Vaartstra teaches the equivalence of tetramethyl ammonium fluoride to

Art Unit: 1751

ammonium fluoride in a similar cleaning composition and further, Mullee or '613 teach the use of ammonium fluoride. Furthermore, the Examiner maintains that one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly have been motivated to use tetramethylammonium hydroxide in the composition taught by Mullee, '613, or Xu et al, with a reasonable expectation of success, because Skee et al teach the equivalence of quaternary ammonium hydroxide to various amines as an alkaline compound in a similar cleaning composition and further, Mullee, '613, or Xu et al teach the use of alkaline compounds including various amines.

Conclusion

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Remaining references cited but not relied upon are considered to be cumulative to or less pertinent than those relied upon or discussed above.

Applicant is reminded that any evidence to be presented in accordance with 37 CFR 1.131 or 1.132 should be submitted before final rejection in order to be considered timely.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory R. Del Cotto whose telephone number is (571) 272-1312. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas McGinty can be reached on (571) 272-1029. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1751

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Gregory R. Del Cotto
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1751

GRD
August 17, 2007